

body concerned was dead and gone? Who will believe it?

I see \$37,695 entered as due to Pierre Menard, in Virginia—1779. What next? Noah's ark will

come up next, as a Virginia claim, \$50,000 for the ship-scraper work and material!

Mr. GRINNELL, of MASS, from the House Committee of Commerce, reports ably in favor of the erection of Marine Hospitals at New Bedford and New London, for the relief of Seamen when sick and disabled. New Bedford district owns 437 vessels in the whole-Bedford, maintaining 138,332 tons, and New London owns 205 vessels in same trade, 69,393 tons—the seamen in both numbering nearly 14,000 men.

The reports on Woolworth's planning patent received, by Messrs WALKER, A.C., and WOODWARD, of the House of Representatives, are adverse. By Mr. OTIS are at length in type. The majority consider that Woolworth's invention is, next to WHITNEY's Cotton gin, the greatest labor-saving machine ever produced in the United States; that it has been infringed; that the Supreme Court has sustained the patentee; that law costs have

been heavy, that WOODWORTH died poor, and that although he and his heirs and assignees have had 25 years allowed to them, from 1828 to 1856, a patent and two renewals it is right to give the managers other 7 years of the monopoly, from 1856 to 1863. Why not 1863?

THE Washington papers publish a correspondence between Sir H. L. Bulwer and Mr. Clayton in reference to the approaching Great Industrial Exhibition at London. Sir Henry officially invites the cooperation of Americans in the undertaking.

Railroad Accident—Philadelphia Markets.
Correspondence of THE TRIBUNE.

PHILADELPHIA, Tuesday, April 9.

The afternoon train of railroad cars from Harris-

[illegible]

Commercial Intelligence, &c.

From our Correspondent

New York, Wednesday, March 27, 1856.

Mexico; Greely & McKittrick:

The shipments of sugars in the week ending on the 24th embraced 21,004 boxes, of which 2,675 were for New-York, 2,079 for Philadelphia, 1,000 for New-Orleans, 60 for Savannah, and 3 for Charleston; the balance for Europe, save 541 boxes for Buenos Ayres. The prices ranging through the shades of Whites, have been from 4 to 8 cents for the regular quality, and 3 to 4 for the inferior grades. The ordinary Browns to superior have found from 2½ to 3½ cts.; Deseane Browns, 5 to 5½. No sales of Celles of any moment. A list of second quality brought \$11½ per cun-

United States for Sugars from \$5c to \$1.25 per box; Molasses, \$2.50 to \$3.00 per hhd. European Freight has varied from \$2.12 to \$3.10, the highest for Cowses and a port from the Mediterranean to Trieste for market, France, \$5.00 per ton in France.

Exchanges have changed slowly. London 10 to 104 prem.; Paris 104 1/2; New York 104 cent. dis.; Boston the same; Rio de Janeiro 104 1/2; Rio de Janeiro 104 1/2; New-Orleans (short) 104 1/2 cent. prem. Cutish 2 25 to 2 35; Orleans, long strings \$5.50 to \$6; Mackerel 2 50 to 2 55; Whiting 2 50 to 3 00; Haddock 2 50 to 3 00; Lord 11 50 to 12 00; Hoops \$4.00 to \$4.50 per M. Empty Hhds. 100 number remains low on account of the large stock in the yards.

Winter. Easter holidays are upon us, and business will languish for ten or twelve days, while there is a total suspension in all the public offices excepting the Custom-House.

Your obedient servant, Q. F. O.

—

PROFESSOR SEWSTER—The Boston Journal on Monday says: So far as external appearances indicate, this unfortunate man has become reconciled to his fate—calm and thoughtful, and occupying the greater part of his

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

You taunt me with making marriage "an agreement between two persons to live together during pleasure." I should certainly rather view it thus, than as an "agreement to live together during displeasure." But, properly speaking, it is not an agreement of the parties at all, if by that word be meant the unforced assumption of an obligation

by them. The lovers desire the possession of each other's person. The State allows this only upon their covenanting that this possession shall be exclusive to themselves. Consequently, whenever a fixed aversion arises between the parties, they feel themselves suffering, not from their own act, but from that of the State. It was the State alone which imposed this pledge of outward fidelity, holding out a lure the while which would make any pledge easy, were it the creeping upon one's hands and knees from Dan to Beersheba. The lovers could have been quite happy without any such pledge. It was only the interests of the State which exacted it. Let us, therefore, say the parties, besiege the State for relief. Our misery flows from it alone. Let it furnish the remedy.

What prevents the State doing so? What prevents the State doing so? What prevents the State doing so?

vents it allowing freedom of divorce. The dread of forfeiting permanent home, which accrues to it from the institution of permanent marriage, enforces permanent marriage upon its subjects because it is incapable of rearing and educating its offspring. Its defective organization makes no provision for the infantile nurture and development of those who are to constitute its future body. Society, therefore, feeling the vital importance of such provision to its own stability, bestows abundant honor upon the parental relation, the integrity and efficiency of which are guaranteed only by the institution of permanent marriage. This is the interest which lies at the root of the institution, and which Society fears to compromise by allowing freedom of divorce.

Is the fear of Society in this respect well-founded? Is it probable that freedom of divorce would render the marriage less permanent than it now is? I think not. On the contrary, I think it would

power, and the permanent, including a wily one, to harm the other. The love which is the basis of the charming, the love which is the basis of the poetry the lovers foresew in it, is the fact that they no longer freely yield themselves to each other, but each is *entitled* to the other, willy-nilly. The sovereign charm of love is that the relation of the parties is purely personal or spontaneous, that each yields the other an *unconstrained* homage.—The moment that either suspects the other of an interested motive, pecuniary or social, that moment love unfolds his wings and returns to Heaven. It will not suffer constraint. For this reason it is that marriage so often becomes the grave of love. Its essential freedom is surrendered to the exigencies of the State. The lovers have exchanged their personal relation for a civil relation. They are no longer sovereign to each other, but parts of a stupendous mechanism, which they may enjoy or perish. Their intimacy, as no loyalty is needed,

known only to God and themselves, it is laid bare to the garish eye of day, and profaned by the ascent or dissent of the universal rabble. The whole public has become a party to the relation, and exerts a controlling influence upon its duration. Consequently the very life of love, which is freedom or privacy, is slain, and the parties who yesterday thought their relation too intimate for the light of Heaven to penetrate, see it to-day desecrated and polluted by the universal public gaze.

Freedom of divorce would restore personal relations to the parties, and rekindle the faded joys of love. Were this freedom legitimated to-morrow, I doubt not that many who to-day desire separation would hesitate to avail themselves of the permission. It would not only itself inhibit their present cordial intercourse, namely, civil obligation, would thus be removed, and the way would be thereby untried relations to each other. Rather,

would be brought back to its original purity, and each recover in the eyes of the other somewhat of that primal innocence which characterized them before the serpent bias of human policy deadened the voice of God in their souls. You entirely misconceive the truth of the matter, if you suppose